

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PD020080
Final Office Action Date: June 18, 2009

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1 – 4, 7 - 10 are pending. Claims 8 – 12 are newly added claims. Claims 1 - 4, and 7 have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as their invention. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

Rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,917).

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Min pertains to the manufacture of CD-ROMs through the use of a master stamper (col. 1, lines 58 – 61). The system of Min has a CD-ROM drive installed in a computer (col. 3, lines 7 -10). The CD-ROM drive has a microcomputer, digital signal processor (“DSP”), a servo signal processor (“SSP”), and a decoder (see Fig. 3). The computer produces a predetermined read-out command that is sent to the microcomputer (col. 3, lines 7-10). The microcomputer enables the DSP and SSP to search for the sub-Q-code area of a first frame according to the read-out command (col. 3, lines 11-24). The microcomputer enables a decoder and reads the header (col. 3, lines 25 – 26).

Then, the microcomputer calculates the difference between the stored sub-Q code and the read header (col. 3, lines 28 – 34). Once the difference is determined, it is checked whether this difference is negative or positive, and whether the difference exceeds a threshold value (col. 3, lines 36 – 47). The determined difference is used to compute two additional values, FLAG and VALUE, which are displayed on a monitor for use in adjusting the recording structure of the master stamper (col. 3, lines 54 – 58: *“This provides the CD-ROM manufacturer an indication of the difference between the sub-Q code and a header, thereby facilitating the CD-ROM manufacturer in adjusting the recording structure of the master stamper”*)

Amended claim 1 recites *“sending, by the micro controller, one or more sectors to the data processing system”* and *“requesting, by the micro controller, information about*

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PD020080
Final Office Action Date: June 18, 2009

the sector headers of the sectors received by the data processing system from the data processing system, the information about the sector headers including at least a sector address." Min does not disclose these steps. By contrast, the computer in Min produces a read-out command that is sent to the microcomputer and the microcomputer, through a DSP and SSP, searches for the sub-Q code. The microcomputer, through a decoder, reads the header. Clearly, Min does not disclose the above-referenced steps of amended claim 1.

Amended claim 1 recites *"calculating, by the micro controller, a difference between the subcode time codes and the sector addresses using the information about the sector headers, the micro controller taking the calculated difference into account when the micro controller requests to read data of a specified time from the recording medium"*. Min does not disclose this step. By contrast, Min uses the difference to adjust a recording structure of a master stamper. The recording structure does not read data. Clearly, the above-referenced step of amended claim 1 is not recited in Min.

Amended claim 1 recites *"repeating the synchronisation steps for different sessions recorded on the same recording medium."* Min pertains to the replication of a CD-ROM using a CD mastering process. A CD mastering process presses, via a master stamper, the entire disc in one physical stamping operation. As such, there is only one session on the CD-ROM in Min. Thus, Min does not disclose or suggest this step.

In view of the above, Min does not teach or suggest all the steps in amended claim 1 and as such, amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Min.

Furthermore, one skilled in the art would readily recognize that the manufacturing process of Min is a CD mastering process since it involves the use of a master stamper. The CD mastering process uses a master stamper to press the data onto the polycarbonate substrate of the CD. CD mastering is used in CD-ROMs that only have a single session. CD mastering differs from burning. CD burning writes data sequentially whereby the CD mastering process presses or "writes" the entire disc in one physical stamping operation. Since the entire disc is pressed in one physical stamping operation, CD mastering is limited to single session read-only CDs. As such, one skilled in the art would not look to

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PD020080
Final Office Action Date: June 18, 2009

Min to solve the problem of synchronizing subcode time codes and sector addresses of a CD having one or more sessions.

Additionally, Min does not give any hint that the disclosed solution could be used for synchronizing subcode time codes and sector addresses. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have no motivation to apply the teachings of Min to synchronize subcode time codes and sector addresses.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over Min. The remaining independent claims, and the claims that depend on them, recite the above-referenced features and are believed to be patentably distinguishable over Min for the same reasons as discussed with respect to amended claim 1.

Rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ludtke (PGPUB US 2002/0089517).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Min as applied to claim 1 in view of Ludtke. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Ludtke is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Min explained above in conjunction with amended claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PD020080
Final Office Action Date: June 18, 2009

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

It is believed that there are no additional fees due with regard to the filing of this response. However if there is an additional fee due, please charge the fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,677
Phone (609) 734-6815

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

Date: 9/16/09